Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU #6299 Case file #198-2347.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a guilty plea, no testimony transcript.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 12:00 PM (Time), 12/04/03 (Date)

File #: 198-2347

Laboratory #(s): 20412074, 20510019

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
UL	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: None

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 20412074, 20510019 Date: May 11, 1982

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 20412074, 20510019

Initials: SUL

CRM-28327

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 4/1/82.

Results of Review

File #: 198-2347 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q8, K1-K3

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination(s)?**
☐ Yes ☐ No X ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SLM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 198-2347

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are hard to interpret. The microspectrophotometry spectra are not labeled correctly.

Review completed at: 12:30 PM (Time), 12/04/03 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.50 hrs.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Jane Kilcullen — Dec. 4, 2003

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SHL